REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended to clarify what is being claimed, thus rendering such rejection moot. Moreover, the Examiner mentions reference to "reacting based..." language, which is non-existent in the claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to clarify what is being claimed, thus rendering such rejection moot.

Specifically, in response to the Examiner's argument that the claims allegedly include no significant recitation of the data processing system or calculating computer for performing data processing operations, applicant respectfully disagrees, but has nevertheless clarified the claims to further emphasize the data processing system or calculating computer for performing data processing operations.

Still yet, the Examiner has issued a double patenting rejection, provisionally rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as claims 1-20 of copending Applicant No.: 10/644,944. This rejection is deemed moot in view of the terminal disclaimer submitted herewith.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Delurgio et al. (US 6,553,352) Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

Specifically, the claims addressed in the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) are those of co-pending application serial number 10/644,944, and not those associated with the present application. It thus appears the Examiner merely copied the substance of the rejection of application serial number 10/644,944.

While this is assumed to be an inadvertent error, applicant has nevertheless amended the claims in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application, with limitations that clearly further distinguish Delurgio.

If the Examiner issues another rejection (as opposed to a notice of allowance), it is respectfully requested that such rejection be NON-FINAL, in view of the fact that the present rejection obviously relates to a different application.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Delurgio reference, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. A notice of allowance or specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim elements, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings the subject matter in the newly added claims to the Examiner's attention, for full consideration.

Yet again, a notice of allowance or specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim elements, in combination with the remaining claimed features, is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. For payment of any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the

Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. ABE1P001).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 505-5100